

the issuance of a new Office Action resetting the time and the reasons why the Action is being made final.

The Examiner has objected to the application as being informal in the arrangement of the specification. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended the arrangement of the specification in the substitute specification being filed herewith. No new matter has been added and the substitute specification is fully supported by the original specification. Therefore, Applicant believes that the Examiner's objection has been overcome.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1-3 for various informalities. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's comments and has, by way of the present amendment, canceled Claims 1-3 and added new Claims 4-8 which more clearly recite Applicant's invention. No new matter has been added and the claims are fully supported by the original specification. Therefore, Applicant believes that the Examiner's objection is moot.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2 as failing to define the invention in that the claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. Also, the Examiner states that Claims 2 and 3 are vague, indefinite, and unclear. Applicant has canceled Claims 1-3 and therefore, believes that the Examiner's rejection is moot. New Claims 4-8 have been added in order to more clearly define Applicant's invention. No new matter has been added and the claims are fully supported by the original specification.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Secor. The Examiner states that Peterson discloses an audio-video system comprising a means for recording a constant view of the drivers and road in

front when the vehicle is on. The Examiner also states that it is well known to capture images of the view, rear view, and any instrumentation of recording views but that Peterson fails to teach the means for constantly recording the view of the odometer, speedometer, and the superimposition of time and date on image. The Examiner relies on Secor to teach the constantly recording view of the odometer, the speedometer, the time, and the date. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the constantly recording view of the odometer, the speedometer, the time, and the date with a camera constantly recording the front and rear views for the purpose of obtaining all possible and relevant information when policemen making an arrest or pulling over violating drivers so that one process faster when retaining accurate data. The Examiner also states that one of ordinary skill would obviously recognize that all cameras have a rewind button and that the amount of time is not considered to be patentably significant.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner states that the relative positioning of a female output jack is not considered to have patentable weight since the female output jack can be placed anywhere regardless of whether it is outside or inside.

Regarding Claim 3, the Examiner states that the portability of a camera is not considered to be patentable since the portability of an object is not inventive and does not yield any unexpected results.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position. Claims 1-3 have been canceled in order to overcome the objections and rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2 made by the Examiner. New Claims 4-8 have been added which Applicant believes

more clearly define Applicant's invention. The following comments address the Examiner's substantive rejections as far as these rejections are applicable to new Claims 4-8.

Applicant's invention is directed toward an observation and recording system which is mounted within a motor vehicle. The system allows for the conditions forward of the vehicle to be recorded as well as the driver, the speedometer, and the odometer of the vehicle.

Peterson discloses a vehicle mounted surveillance and videotaping system which includes a camera mounted within a police vehicle and a video recorder housed in a vault in the trunk of the vehicle. The camera focuses on the conditions in front of the vehicle including motorists on the road in front of the police vehicle. The camera does not focus on any instrumentation within the police vehicle or on the driver of the police vehicle.

Secor adds little, if anything to the teaching of Peterson. Secor discloses a rear viewing arrangement for a motor vehicle which permits the driver to view traffic conditions to the rear and right and left sides of the vehicle. Left and right video cameras are mounted on the left and right sides of the vehicle, respectively, and forward of the driver's position. The images viewed from the cameras are reproduced on an LCD viewing screen which is integrated on the vehicle's dashboard. The integrated dashboard display also includes a speedometer and an odometer. However, lenses are not focused on the driver, the road in front of the driver, or the instrumentation within the vehicle as recited by Applicant.

Neither of the references relied upon by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination, discloses, suggests, or renders obvious Applicant's invention as it is now claimed. That is, neither Peterson nor Secor discloses an observation and recording system for a motor vehicle as recited by Applicant. Applicant recites a camera which is directed at the view forward



of the driver of the vehicle and at the driver and means for recording the images observed by the camera. The claims also recite, among other things, that information is recorded from the speedometer and odometer of the vehicle. Therefore, if the teachings of these two patents were combined as the Examiner suggests, Applicant's invention, as it is now being claimed, would not result.

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims presently in the application clearly and patentably distinguish over the references of record and should be allowed. It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance and an early action toward that end is most respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN P. SENATORE

By:


Norman E. Lehrer

Registration No. 26,561

Dated: July 10, 2000